

**Highland Council**

**15 February 2018**

**Revenue Budget 2018/19**

**Details of Proposed Budget Savings**

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care and Learning</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Family teams</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Family teams</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>45.3</b>

Ref. CL6

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.125	7.0
2019/20	0.125	
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.250</b>	<b>7.0</b>

<b>Service Impact</b>
Moderate impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal crosses over all Area Family Team budgets and addresses the management and supervisory posts within the teams. It does not directly impact on any practitioner posts.

There are 8 District Managers on grade HC11 and 37.3 Practice Leads on grade HC10. The District Managers manage and support the Practice Leads and are in turn managed and supported by the Children's Services Managers, of which there are 4 posts (one per Area). These teams fulfil universal child health, social care, and care and protection social work functions. They comprise health professionals, social care workers and qualified social workers.

The proposal is to merge the posts of District Manager and Practice Lead to remove a layer of management. The detail is as follows:

- Deletion of 37.3 Practice Lead and 8 District Manager posts.
- Creation of 37.3 new supervisory posts – grade to be determined.
- Creation of one additional Children's Services Manager post at HC13 (necessary due to there being 18.3 supervisory posts in the South Area).

It will be necessary to plan and manage this reorganisation, in order to sustain safe services and to avoid any compulsory redundancies, and full implementation should be achieved by October. Redrafting of all Job Descriptions and Person Specifications will be necessary, particularly as the current structure specifies different qualification requirements for the various Practice Lead posts e.g. health visitor, teaching or social work qualification.

The Practice Lead (Early Years) post requires a Health Visitor qualification and the staff are employed on Agenda for Change terms and conditions. This will need to be factored into the planning for these changes.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

First-line managers will no longer have access to a District Manager for support and supervision. The Children's Services Managers and the new management post will carry all of the operational and strategic responsibilities for health and social care in each Area.

The new supervisory post may not be able to cover for vacant practitioner posts, as their primary function will be to manage and support the team. This may put pressure on practitioner workload or lead to re-prioritisation of the allocation of cases.

The Children's Services Manager role will become more operational in focus, with a resulting loss of opportunity to progress strategic responsibilities for the wider service. This may lead to re-allocation of tasks to more senior staff or some areas of work being given a lower priority.

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :</b>	
<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES
<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>	
<p>Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. There are potential impacts identified as a result of the proposal across all three strands. The customer-facing services are not directly impacted, but the first-line managers will have reduced access to support and may be expected to carry out some strategic tasks. There will be a bigger impact in rural areas where the overall reduction in management means that new combined posts will involve less face-to-face contact with a senior manager who may not be based in the same locality.</p> <p>The function of Family Teams is to support children and young people who are facing challenges and pressures, which will include poverty, disability and social difficulties.</p> <p>In mitigation, it is expected that rationalisation of the front-line manager role will improve recruitment and retention as these posts have often been hard to fill. An additional post has been proposed for the South area because of the volume and extent of additional line management responsibilities.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care &amp; Learning</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Other Leisure Services</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduction in Eden Court Funding</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.502m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Ref. CL8

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.200	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.200	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Significant impact on service</p>
---

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal involves a reduction in funding to Eden Court in 2018/19.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This saving is the equivalent of a 40% reduction in funding to Eden Court. Through the Service Delivery Contract, current funding supports the delivery of dance and drama qualifications and the extensive creative learning outreach programme, and also supports the delivery of an overall programme of activity. The three elements are interdependent and Council funding does not meet the total costs of any of them.

The impact of this proposal is not yet known and will require further discussion with the Eden Court Board and incoming Chief Executive. It is anticipated that there will be impact upon the delivery of dance and drama qualifications and the creative community outreach programme delivered across the Areas and to vulnerable groups.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, i.e. screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES  NO

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. There are potential impacts identified as a result of the proposal across all three strands. The proposal may result in a reduction to the delivery of drama and dance qualifications which are not provided elsewhere. The Creative outreach programme involves some vulnerable young people who have struggled in mainstream education. There will be no alternative comparable provision, but they could be engaged in other activities. There may also be an impact on rural communities, should the outreach programme be reduced.

The full impact of this proposal will not be known until discussions have concluded with the Eden Court Board.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	Care & Learning		<b>Ref.</b>	CL10
<b>Budget Heading</b>	Services for Adults			
<b>Savings Name</b>	Reduce budget for adult support services			
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.144	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.144	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

A 10% reduction for Women's Aid Groups would save £78k across their activities, as below:

Women's Aid Organisation	Housing Support	Violence against women	Children's Services	Total budget	10% reduction
Caithness and Sutherland Reduced total payment	111,948	14,200	24,000	<b>150,148</b>	15,015 135,133
Inverness Reduced total payment	223,277	38,060		<b>261,337</b>	26,134 235,203
Lochaber Reduced total payment	98,177	14,200		<b>112,377</b>	11,238 101,139
Ross-shire Reduced total payment	218,284	14,200	28,585	<b>261,069</b>	26,107 234,962
<b>TOTAL SAVING</b>					<b>78,494</b>

While Criminal Justice Social Work is centrally funded by Government, some Highland Council funding has been provided over the years to meet the cost of local changes to posts, and this additional amount would be reduced by 50%, achieving £60k.

A reduction of funding to Blindcraft of 10% would achieve £5.5k.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

There would be a proportionate reduction in refuge and support to vulnerable women and children. This would place additional pressure on the Family Teams. It is assessed that this would result in a moderate impact on service.

The reduction of funding to Criminal Justice Social Work would not impact on frontline service delivery or Scottish Government National Outcomes and Standards. It will be achieved through vacancy management over the year.

The reduction of funding to Blindcraft of 10% would enable the business to remain sustainable. It would involve a slight impact on service.

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :</b>	
<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES
<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NO
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>	
<p>Screening for equalities, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out.</p> <p>a) Women's Aid Organisations – an equality impact assessment has been carried out and there is negative equality impact identified. Women's Aid services are gender specific, but affect women of all ages, faiths, ethnicities and those affected by disability. No mitigation is identified, although further meetings are arranged to keep the 4 groups fully up to date and to support them implement any savings. There are potential poverty impacts as women experiencing domestic abuse are more likely to end up in poverty, and also women in poverty are often more vulnerable to abuse and violence.</p> <p>b) Criminal Justice Social Work – there is no equality, rural or poverty impact identified.</p> <p>c) Blindcraft – there is no significant equality, rural or poverty impact identified.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	Care and Learning			<b>Ref.</b>	CL13
<b>Budget Heading</b>	PPP Contracts				
<b>Savings Name</b>	Negotiate savings from contracts with regard to service standards and access times				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	£27m	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	NIL		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.100	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.100	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council has two schools PPP contracts, covering 15 schools. It is proposed to seek further savings from contracts to the value of £0.100m. This to be achieved through reviewing current service standards, and any scope to achieve savings against these, and current arrangements for purchase of hours outwith school time.

The Redesign school let review has already considered reports highlighting that for schools PPP2, the Council purchases additional 'Flexible Use Hours' to provide for access to facilities outwith normal school times. Over the past 3 years, the actual use of these hours is significantly below the level paid for through the contract, and there is opportunity to review, and achieve saving.

Discussions will also take place with both PPP providers regarding the scope for further saving opportunities in relation to service standards, including cleaning and facilities management. The Council has over recent years taken significant savings from its own in-house cleaning budget, but to date savings have not been negotiated from the PPP schools contract in this area.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

It is expected that any saving from 'Flexible Use Hours' can be achieved with little or no service user impact, given the actual use of these hours in recent years has been below the level purchased through the contract.

Any reduction in service standards, including Facilities Management or cleaning may have some end user impact, though the intention would be to minimise or mitigate where possible.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO

<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>NO</p>
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>As stated above, while reduction on flexible use hours would reduce the hours available outwith school time for community use, in practice these hours have not been used in recent years, and this proposal would bring the contract into line with the hours currently being utilised.</p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care and Learning</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Childcare and Early Learning</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Income from wraparound care based on 10% increase</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>Nil</b>

Ref. CL14

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.100	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.100	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Many parents wish to purchase additional early learning and childcare (ELC) from a range of providers in Highland including the local authority. Local authority uptake of ELC accounts for approximately 70% of all provision and is based on parental choice and the availability of places. Some parents also purchase out-of-school care (OSC) from the local authority.

The local authority currently charges £4 an hour for additional non-funded ELC and £10.60 for a three hour OSC session. Some settings are currently testing hourly charges for OSC at £4 an hour.

It is proposed to increase these charges and any charges for holiday cover by 10%.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

The impact of a 10% increase in charges is not clear, but it is assumed that there will be a reduction; hence the budgetary increase is less than 10%.

There would be no impact on statutory services. Parents can still choose whether they wish to purchase additional childcare.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES

<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>NO</p>
--	----------------------

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening has been undertaken and identified potential rural and poverty impacts associated with the proposal.

Additional ELC hours are generally purchased by working parents to enable them to balance the challenges of work and childcare. Therefore the increase in charges will generally be affordable.

With the increase in charges, parents will decide if they wish to look to another provider for childcare, which may be more difficult in rural areas and any increase in charges for working parents on low income will always be a challenge when balancing household budgets.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	Care and Learning		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	Adult Services		
<b>Savings Name</b>	Out of Hours Social Work		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	£0.075m	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	0

Ref. CL15

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.050	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.050	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

It is proposed to cease use of the call handling hub which is administered by NHS Highland, and has supported the Out of Hours Social Work Team. Instead, calls will be received direct by the team.

The Out of Hours team covers all service requests that require social work support, and also deals with many calls related to home care, particularly liaising with home care providers and service users when there is an unplanned interruption to services for any reason.

The current budget and staffing information shown above represents the Highland Council contribution rather than the total NHS Highland budget for the service.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

There may be a small limited increase in the number of calls received by the Out of Hours team, which are not relevant to that service and would need redirection, as happened prior to the call handling hub being established. This can be absorbed.

The work of the Out of Hours team will continue largely unchanged. It is not anticipated that this change would adversely affect the team's ability to perform its usual functions. A small budget is retained for any continuing costs.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO

<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>NA</p>
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The change will not directly affect service users. The two services will continue to liaise as usual. The anticipated benefits when the arrangement was initially put in place were that call handlers would take details of calls, check Care First (social care recording system) to see if the subject was known and pass details to the duty Social Worker. They would then make an initial open Observation on Care First which the Out of Hours team would add to and complete after dealing with the call.</p> <p>It was expected that this would then develop into call handlers using CM2000, the Care at Home scheduler, to deal with routine queries from Care At Home staff, e.g. confirm address, keysafe numbers, confirm cover, etc.</p> <p>In practice, these benefits have not been achieved, and there is little added value for the operation of the Out of Hours team, with some duplication of work across the services.</p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care and Learning</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Service Wide</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce Training Budgets</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.413m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>

Ref. CL16

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.150	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.150</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This budget covers the costs of staff training for services across Care and Learning. It is proposed to reduce a number of training budgets across the service, to create a budget saving of 150k.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This saving represents more than one third of all Service training budgets, across all professional disciplines. There will be reduced training opportunities for all professional disciplines, and different approaches will also have to be identified.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

**1. Equality:** Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age , disability , sex , mental health , gender identity , religion or belief , pregnancy or maternity , marriage or civil partnership )?

NO

**2. Rural:** Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?

YES

**3. Poverty:** Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?

NO

#### 4. Assessment:

**a)** Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?

YES

**b)** Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?

YES

#### Summary of Community Impact:

Screenings have been undertaken for equality, rural and poverty impacts. With reduced budgets there is a possibility that staff based in more rural areas may not be able to access training at a distance. This will be kept under review by managers.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care and Learning</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Childcare and Early Learning</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce financial support to childcare providers</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.685m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Ref. CL17

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.200	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.200	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council has a responsibility to support availability of childcare provision. Requests for such support cover: after school and holiday provision; the cost of equipment, resources and repairs; support to childminders; funding for youth projects; ASN project funding for all ages; and crèches.

Over the last two years, officers have worked with partners to ensure that any applications are rationalised to ensure best value and promote sustainability. Year on year funding applications have been reducing, and the total budget can be reviewed.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

Whilst this change could affect the capacity of some 3<sup>rd</sup> sector groups to provide childcare services, it is broadly in line with reducing levels of subsidy in recent years. This has meant that due to rationalisation, improved scrutiny and budget management, there have been less grant payments made over the last 2 years.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, i.e. screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES  YES

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening has identified potential impacts for equality, rural and poverty. Reduction in the funding may reduce aspects of provision to some vulnerable groups e.g. ASN support, support to groups in fragile rural communities but this has not been demonstrated over the last year, where we have continued to provide funding for grant requests. Mitigation is that we are mindful of any community impacts when assessing applications and would ensure wider discussion to ensure we did not disadvantage any particular group or sector.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	Care and Learning		<b>Ref.</b>	CL19
<b>Budget Heading</b>	Grants to Voluntary Organisations			
<b>Savings Name</b>	Caithness Horizons			
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	£0.090m	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.015	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.015	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Caithness Horizons is a Charitable Company Ltd by Guarantee that was founded in 2007 by Highland Council, UKAEA and Thurso Heritage Society to operate a visitor attraction in Thurso Town Hall. The saving proposal will reduce funding to the organisation from £90,000 to £75,000. Funding of £75,000 will be provided for 2018/19, with future years funding subject to subsequent review.</p>
--

<p><b>Service Impact</b> <i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i></p> <p>The Council is keen to support community bodies to develop new ways to deliver sustainable services that are affordable, efficient and local. A gradual reduction in funding would afford the opportunity for the organisation to explore additional funding streams and ways of generating income in order to place them on a more sustainable footing.</p>
--

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES
<p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts. However, this will directly impact upon the group and require them to seek alternative sources of funding. Discussions have taken place with Caithness Horizons, and there other major funder (Dounreay) and the proposed saving is considered achievable, and in line with Caithness Horizon's own business plan.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Care &amp; Learning</b>		<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CL20</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Music</b>			
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Blas Festival</b>			
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.070m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.007	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.007	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Blas is a partnership between The Highland Council and Fèisean nan Gàidheal, who run the festival on the Council's behalf. Funding has been reduced by 40% since 2012. This proposal would reduce it by a further 10% in 2018/19.</p>
---

<p><b>Service Impact</b> <i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i></p> <p>Around a third of the funding required to run Blas comes from Highland Council. The remainder is raised by Fèisean nan Gàidheal in ticket income, other agencies (such as Creative Scotland, Argyll &amp; Bute Council, HIE and Bòrd na Gàidhlig) and any sponsorship.</p> <p>The reduction in funding at this stage in the planning for 2018/19 event would be disruptive. Fèisean nan Gàidheal have scoped the impact of a planned reduction of this amount (dependent on other funding being sustained). This would involve a reduction of around 10% in the number of events, including those held in the Council area, and a more limited schools and community programme.</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES
<p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>Screening for equality, poverty and rural impacts has been carried out. The proposal is likely to lead to a reduction in the school and community programme provided. However, the impact will be limited as it does not directly involve a large number of schools.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	Care and Learning	<b>Ref.</b>	CL22
<b>Budget Heading</b>	Various		
<b>Savings Name</b>	Management and Administration		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.252	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.252	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>This involves savings on a range of management and administration budgets across the Care and Learning Service. These include: deleting the redundant post of Headteacher at the Black Isle Education Centre; rationalisation of budgets across specialist services; changed support for school-based assessments; and reduced contingency for service changes.</p>
---

<p><b>Service Impact</b> <i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i></p> <p>Managers and staff will require to optimise use of identified budgets for specialist services, and there will be some changes to how services are delivered and managed, but is envisaged that this will have only slight impact on service delivery.</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES
<p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p> <p>Managers and staff will manage the rationalisation of budgets to protect local service delivery.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Chief Executive's Office</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Operational Management Areas (Ward Management)</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Ward Discretionary Grant</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.667m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>

Ref. CEO1

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.331	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.331</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The proposal is to reduce the ward discretionary grant budget by almost half (£0.331m or 49.6%) to £0.336m.

In 2017/18 the Ward Discretionary Grant budget is £33,240 per Ward (£698k in total). Based on earlier budget decisions this is set to reduce to £31,789 per Ward for 2018/19 (£667k in total).

The reduction means that each Ward would have £16,000 to invest in local community projects and services. This investment would still enable methods such as participatory budgeting to be used and to support Members' intentions around localism, redesign and community action.

Ward Discretionary Grant can continue to support the Council's Programme with commitments to: "Put our communities at the heart of the design and delivery of services at a local level"; "Support Community Groups to do more" and "Develop new ways to deliver services that are affordable, efficient and local".

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

The budget supports various community projects and initiatives regarded as beneficial locally. Sometimes the Council is among other funders enabling some larger local projects to proceed. The number and/or the value of grants awarded to support community projects or initiatives will reduce.

The impact of this reduction will be felt most where there is a lack of alternative local funds for Community Bodies to apply for (e.g. Community Benefit Funds or Common Good Funds).

Grants are awarded annually however in some Wards the grants paid to groups have been recurring. Should any of these groups be affected by the ward reduced budget they may have to find alternative or additional funding to sustain the service at current levels. In these circumstances, although the risk is likely to be low, further engagement with such groups would be required to understand if there may be any employment liabilities. Recurring funding should be reviewed during 2018/19 as part of the review of the single grants process.

Over the past 2 years in some areas the allocation of the grant has involved community groups and local people, through participatory budgeting events and as part of the Council's approach to localism. Some areas may revisit their plans to hold participatory budgeting events in 2018/19 including how much to make available (Dingwall and Seaforth and Badenoch and Strathspey). Participatory budgeting as a method of engagement does not have to be confined to discretionary budgets and can be developed around choices on mainstream service budgets.

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :</b>	
<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES
<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NO
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>	
<p>Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. Reducing financial support for community bodies to undertake their activities could have impacts for places and people, including those with protected characteristics where they would be beneficiaries of the groups' activities. However choices can still be made on what to fund and to minimise impact on disadvantaged groups within the community. Locally some groups may have access to other funds such as Common Good Funds (in some areas of Inverness and in some towns) or Community Benefit (largely in rural areas) but not in every place and there is no guarantee of such support. However, ward discretionary grant is discretionary and not statutory and it is not an entitlement. Participatory budgeting could focus instead on involving communities in choices around mainstream spending.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Chief Executive's Office</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CEO2</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Policy and Reform</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce Community Council Grants</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.188m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.100	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.100</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Significant impact on service</p>
---

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

It is proposed to remove £0.1m from the total Community Council Grants budget of £0.188m. The proposal would reduce the current grant available for Community Councils by 53%.

Community Councils currently receive an administration grant from the Council to support their running costs – meeting expenses, administration expenses, travel and subsistence and secretarial honorarium. Grants currently range from £760 up to £3,100.

The annual grant is calculated providing each community council with a core amount plus an additional sum per elector. This is set out in the community council scheme. Rural community councils also receive an additional amount.

It is proposed to revise the current grant formula to make the proposed reductions. This would result in:

- A core amount of £350 for each Community Council
- An additional amount of £50 for each rural Community Council – this takes account of the larger geographical areas many rural Community Councils are covering
- An amount of £0.13 per elector – this takes account of the population with each Community Council and accounts for those covering a larger population

The above formula enables the proposed reduction to take place but continues to comply with the commitment set in the Community Council Scheme. It also balances the different pressures facing urban and rural community Councils. The variance in reduction is between 48% and 58%, with larger, urban based Community Councils who have historically received larger grants based on their population, seeing a larger percentage reduction than smaller rural Community Councils.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

The current proposal would see grants reduce between 48% and 58%. The larger, urban based Community Councils would see greater reductions but would be able to absorb this better than those with smaller existing grants.

It is difficult to determine the full impact of this proposal. Each Community Council operates differently; some are very active and involved in a range of activities and sourcing income for these whilst others concentrate on planning and licensing applications and providing a local voice.

Each Community Council therefore utilises the grant provided in different ways. The purpose of the grant is for administration expenses however Community Councils do not always use it for these purposes.

A number of Community Councils have access to other sources of income and some also have significant

reserves. An exercise was carried out in 2015 at which point Community Councils across Highland were holding unrestricted funds of over £850,000. Many are found not to spend their entire grant annually.

The current proposal would see grants reduce between 48% and 58%. This level of reduction will prove difficult for some Community Councils and it may restrict their ability to be more involved in engagement activity in their community at a time when the Council is developing its approach to localism.

The Scheme which sets out the rules governing Community Councils is due to be reviewed this year. It is proposed also to review the way that grants are currently allocated. This should consider whether grants should only cover specific expenses, whether it should take into account other resources available to a Community Council and whether grants should only be paid retrospectively based on actual spend.

**Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :**

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b>  <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?  <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>YES  NA</p>

**Summary of Community Impact:**

There are no identified equalities, rural or poverty impacts from the proposal. The proposed formula provides a specific allowance for rural community councils recognising the different challenges they have in operating. Community Councils will need to be supported going forward to seek different ways of doing things in order to reduce administration expenses.

The proposal will reduce the funding for administration available for Community Councils at a time when proposal CEO1 will also reduce access to alternative funding through the ward discretionary budget. This could make new engagement with Community Councils as part of the Council's approach to localism more problematic.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Chief Executive's Office</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CEO3</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Chief Execs HQ and Area Budgets</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce expenditure across several cost centres</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.868m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>29.4</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.093	0.1
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.093</b>	<b>0.1</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

A review of all cost centres associated with general running costs across a range of budgets in Chief Execs HQ and across all Wards has identified where expenditure can be reduced, based on an analysis of out-turns last year. This excludes Ward Discretionary Budgets and Community Council Grants which have separate detailed savings sheets submitted for specific savings proposals relating to these budgets.

The total saving proposed of £93,000 represents a 21% reduction in non-staffing costs in these budgets and 5% of the total. When added to the two other savings proposed for the Chief Executive's Office budget, the total savings equate to a 51% reduction in the total non-staffing budget or a 24% reduction in the total Chief Executive's Office's net budget (excl members).

Since 2014/15 the Chief Executive's Office has provided total savings amounting to £2.455m, resulting in the budget being 36% smaller in 2017/18 than it was 4 years ago. The Office has not ceased providing any functions over this period and in future years will lead on the development of localism agenda and continue to support Redesign.

The detail of how the savings have been identified is set out below:

#### **Chief Exec's Office: £4,946 saving**

The budgets associated with the Chief Exec's line are salaries (5.4 fte inc the Chief Executive). It pays the CoSLA Levy (£126k) and a number of statutory registration fees on behalf of the Council; it provides elected member, executive leadership and Programme support; delivers the Council's Ombudsman, FOI and Data Protection/GDPR management and compliance; and holds a small number of general office support budgets e.g stationary, postages, supplies, meetings management. The savings proposed are made up as follows:

- Property maintenance 100% cut: £2000
- Conference and seminar expenses 100% cut: £946
- Postages 33% cut: reduce £3000 by £1,000
- Training 35% cut: reduce £2900 by £1,000

#### **Emergency Planning: £2,100 staffing (0.01fte) and £4,376 non-staffing (cuts) + £15,000 (income) = £21,476 saving**

The budgets associated with the Emergency Planning line are 2 x EP Officers and a full time admin support plus £12,000 for general running costs which includes management and hosting of emergency planning exercises, and costs associated with managing fee-paying contracts and maintaining professional competencies, of which £6,476 is being offered up as savings. The savings/income proposed are made up as follows:

- Catering meetings 22% cut: reduce £2,300 by £500
- Stationary 100% cut: £476
- Printing 100% cut: £700
- Postage 100% cut: £200
- Misc supplies 50% cut: reduce £1000 by £500

- Training 25% cut: £2000 reduce by £500
- Telex/emergency comms 100% cut: £1,500
- 0.1FTE cut to admin post: £2,100
- Additional fee income: £15,000

**Corporate Comms: £20,000 (income) = £20,000 saving**

The budgets associated with the Corporate Comms line are salaries (2FTE plus 1FTE graphic designer plus 1FTE Manager post managing both Communications and Emergency Planning functions) plus £14,000 for general running costs including Graphic Design supplies; newspapers and regulatory communications licensing costs plus costs associated with generating income and managing the advertising contract and resilience functions. The costs of staffing and supplies are largely offset by income. The savings/income proposed are made up as follows:

- Advertising income and sponsorship increase: £18,000
- Income from sponsorship for Quality Awards: £2,000

The total combined income/saving of £41,476 amounts to 21.5% of the total Corporate Comms/Emergency planning budgets.

**Policy and Reform: £28,000 saving**

The budgets associated with the Policy and Reform budget are salaries (5fte + a temporary graduate intern) and small general office costs; it supports the Council's redesign, community planning, poverty and inequalities work, fire and police reform and scrutiny, equalities responsibilities, community empowerment and engagement duties; and a shared service for BSL communication support. The savings proposed are made up as follows:

- Meals and Hospitality 69% cut: reduce £2,899 by £2,000
- Consultants 54% cut: reduce £3,717 by £2,000
- Event management 77% cut: reduce £6,444 by £5,000
- Misc Supplies 100% cut: £2,000
- Third Sector Grants 40% cut: reduce £15,375 by £6,375
- Voluntary Associations 56% cut: reduce £17,976 by £10,000

**Operational Management Areas (OMAs): £19,500 saving**

The budgets associated with the OMAs are for ward management costs. These include staffing (11fte); grants (ward discretionary grant and community council grant are accounted for in separate savings sheets); and other general running costs. The savings proposed are made up as follows:

- Advertising 83% cut: reduce the £2408 budget by £2000
- Hire of halls 48% cut: reduce the £8362 budget by £4000
- Landline telephones 50% cut: reduce the £19815 budget by £10,000
- 38% reduction in the remaining hospitality budget for all areas totalling £3900 by £1500
- Reduce overprovision in the budget (compensation for loss of office) by £2000.

**Service Impact**

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

The savings proposed are largely based on looking at costs incurred in 2016/17 and expected spend in 2017/18. Advertising costs can remain low by using social media more and the hire of halls can be reduced by using more of our own buildings when needed. Training opportunities will be reduced to meet the lesser budget. The Office will continue to transact as much as possible online to reduce postage costs.

The reduction in third sector grants and voluntary associations will mean that in the future there will be a reduced resource to support work on community empowerment and localism. With the exception of the Disability Access Panels (noted below), these budgets do not provide recurring funding and so individual organisations are not directly affected.

Included within the reduction to third sector grants is a 10% reduction in funding to the 8 Disability Access Panels. This will reduce the support provided annually from £1,250 to £1,125 for each panel. The provision of this funding is for general administrative purposes to support them in their role of providing advice to the Council on disability matters particularly associated with planning and development. It is assessed that this level of reduction would still enable them to fulfil this role.

The other items are currently either over-provided for, or, expenditure can be reduced or stopped to reflect the revised budget.

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :</b>	
<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	Yes
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	Yes  No
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  A full equality impact assessment has been undertaken for the potential impact on the saving proposed for Disability Access Panels. This has highlighted that although there may be some negative impact on the groups as a result of this proposed saving, the saving is small and the groups will continue to receive support for their work in advising on disability access issues. The current grant is spent on administration and travel however it is judged that this level of reduction is manageable within the current budget and should have minimal impact on the core activities of the groups.  There were no particular rural or poverty impacts identified.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CR2</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Customer Services</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Efficiency Savings</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.130m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>84.2</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.200	8.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.200</b>	<b>8.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>This saving focusses on the provision of customer services across Highland through the network of Service Points, Service Centre and other related-teams such as Revenues (e.g. Council Tax, Benefits).</p> <p>Given the expanded Corporate Resources Service officers believe that there is scope to manage the workload across the Service more efficiently enabled by fit for purpose IT. Savings can be delivered by the effective management of vacant posts. We also believe that there is scope for new partnership working and cross Council service working, and this will be explored on an individual basis across all locations. Potential partners include High Life Highland, Schools and other Government agencies.</p>
--

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>This proposal is aimed at maintaining or indeed enhancing services in local areas, and will be achieved through efficiencies, with potential for additional income.</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>Community Impact is seen as positive in terms of supporting rural communities by maintaining and enhancing services in local areas. The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Cross Service Efficiency Savings</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£27.892m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>650.52</b>

Ref. CR3

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.280	11.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.280</b>	<b>11.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Cross-Service savings arising from greater collaboration and exploiting synergies across the new enlarged Service. This will be achieved by continuing to automate processes, more effective use of ICT, and utilising staff resources to their optimum level. Examples include e-invoicing, HR/Payroll data management, and managing workloads and removing non-essential tasks.

### Service Impact

The impact may be marginal overall as there will be an overall reduction in posts, managed through turnover and non-filling of vacant posts. However automated processes will lead to enhanced services to customers, both internal and external.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA NA

### Summary of Community Impact:

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CR5</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Non Domestic (Business) Rates</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduction in Discretionary Reliefs</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.701m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.030	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.030</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>This saving arises from the revaluation of business rates effective from April 2017. Changes in rateable value have resulted in some businesses now qualifying for Small Business Bonus Scheme (or having their level of support increased), and as a result the current Council policy on Discretionary Reliefs means that the level of funding required to deliver such reliefs is reduced. This reduction in spending has been achieved in 2017/18 with no change to existing Council policy.</p>
--

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>There is no service impact and no adverse effect on businesses who now achieve the same level of financial support from the Scottish Government rather than the Council.</p>
--

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	ICT		
<b>Savings Name</b>	ICT Development Fund		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	£0.479m	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	N/A

Ref. CR7

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.479	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.479	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal is to reduce the level of financial support to ICT Development. This fund is used to support a range of developments and projects, both to ICT infrastructure (such as PSN compliance), and service enhancement across all Council Services.

Due to the nature of the Fund, any unspent element such as funds committed but not spent within the financial year, is carried forward to future years. At present there is a balance on the fund of c£0.4m, so the contribution for 2018/19 can be reduced without a material impact on the availability of resources to support ICT development.

Reducing funding permanently may not be sustainable so a review will take place in advance of 2019/20. However service developments should be supported by a robust business case that delivers cashable savings, thereby offsetting the impact of a reduction in central funding.

### Service Impact

There is no immediate impact as there is a sufficient balance in the ICT Development Fund. The position will however have to be kept under review.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  NA

**Summary of Community Impact:**

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Training</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduction in professional training</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.060</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Ref. CR8

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.020	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal removes an element of the Service training budget that has been used to support professional training for accountants and auditors. The Service has had 4 trainees who are now achieved full professional qualification, and this training budget is no longer required. The Service has successfully supported training its own staff to achieve this status, and the core salary budget will be used to retain these staff.

Any vacancy that may arise will require a review of this strategy, and may restrict the Service's future ability to invest in training. However there is now the Apprentice funding which may offer financial support for training. This saving does not impact on funding available to support technical, professional and personally training across all elements of the Service.

### Service Impact

There is no immediate service impact.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA NA

### Summary of Community Impact:

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Insurance Fund</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Increase in Self Insurance</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.480m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Ref. CR9

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.311	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.311	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This saving arises from a review of the level of insurance cover carried by the Council; the proportion of premium paid to insurers; the element of policy excess carried by the Council; and the claims history and risk exposure of all Council services.

This saving proposes to reduce the direct premium paid to insurers and assume a higher level of self insurance. Whilst there is an element of financial risk with this proposal, the saving is immediately achieved through the reduction in premium paid. The Council has an Insurance Fund, with an anticipated 2017/18 year-end balance of £2.5m, and this will meet any additional claims below the policy excess.

Previous history does not have certainty over future claims, but analysis over a number of years supports the degree of additional risk being proposed.

Should any material claim arise then the existing proposal may require to be reviewed in future years.

### Service Impact

There is no service impact and no change to the way in which insurance claims are assessed.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  NA

**Summary of Community Impact:**

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Corporate Audit &amp; Performance</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Citizens' Panel annual survey assessment</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.025m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Ref. CR10

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.025	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

At present the annual Citizens' Panel survey is assessed and evaluated externally, giving a degree of independence to the results. This savings proposal removes the external assessment element, and proposes that the work is undertaken internally within the Council, thereby losing the independence of the assessment.

The Service is already a corporate resource and undertakes a number of performance assessments across all Council Services. It is therefore intended that an appropriate level of independence can be maintained.

This saving does however reduce the capacity for other survey and focus work on a range of topics including budget consultation and poverty which the contract with UHI has supported. There is also a likely increased workload on the Chief Executive's Policy Team with already reduced resources.

### Service Impact

There is no loss of service as a result of this proposal.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	NA
<p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA

### Summary of Community Impact:

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Corporate Resources</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Welfare</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Efficiency Gains</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£46.191m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Ref. CR11

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.330	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.330</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<b>Service Impact</b>
No impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This saving arises from the work undertaken by officers at a national level. A combination of efficiency gains achieved through improved processing times and the impact of Universal Credit, has resulted in a greater proportion of national funding coming to Highland for Homelessness.

The Council is already meeting all obligations, and this net additional revenue has been achieved in 2017/18. This saving therefore builds the net additional revenue into the base budget for 2018/19.

Members may recall that at Corporate Resources Committee in November 2017 a budget virement was agreed from the Loans Fund to Homelessness Budget to address a budget pressure of £0.3m. In essence the situation was addressed within the budget before a full analysis of trends in expenditure on housing benefit could be completed. Having addressed the current financial pressure this saving can be delivered without any impact on existing service.

### Service Impact

There is no service impact. All obligations are being met under the current housing benefit scheme, and saving has already been achieved in 2017/18.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NO
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b> a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	NA

<b>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</b>	NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.  Efficiency gains have benefitted customers through quicker responses and consideration of housing benefit applications.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS1</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Play Areas</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Review all play areas, including location, condition and alternative facilities and maximise income from redundant sites</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.402m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>8</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.212	2.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.212	2.0

<b>Service Impact</b>
Moderate impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council currently maintains 435 play areas at an annual cost of £401,814. This is a non-statutory function. This savings proposal is for the Council to:-

1. Rationalise the number of Play Areas that the Council maintains, subject to further discussion at Ward Business Meetings, by removing or passing to community ownership those play areas that have low play value; are redundant; where further maintenance can no longer be justified in terms of cost; and/or there is adequate provision nearby. Concentrate resources on providing quality play facilities at the remaining sites. The budget for repairs will be reduced correspondingly, and a prioritised repairs programme will be introduced for the remaining Play Areas;
2. Seek to maximise income to the Council from redundant sites; and
3. Reduce the staff resource (by 2 FTE through vacancy management) required to inspect and maintain our play areas.

In summer 2017, an external consultant was engaged to carry out independent inspections on the condition of all of our play areas. Obsolete equipment has already been removed, A new repair and maintenance programme is being developed based on the findings of these inspections, and this will be implemented from 1 April 2018.

To complement this work, a more strategic approach to providing outdoor play facilities within the Highlands is being developed. We are in discussions with the Care and Learning Alliance, Highland Third Sector Interface and other 3rd sector partners to explore what opportunities there might be to support the securing and enhancing of play spaces for all ages by working with our communities.

A further proposal is that the review of play areas currently being undertaken is completed and used to develop a strategy for determining future play area provision in the Highlands. It is anticipated that the recommendations in this strategy will include:

- Rationalisation of current play area provision to address facilities that have low play value, where further maintenance can no longer be justified in terms of cost, and / or there is adequate provision nearby; and
- An increased role for communities in future provision and maintenance of play facilities

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

Play areas provision will be focussed on the remaining sites that offer a quality play experience, have low maintenance costs and where there are no alternative sites nearby.

There will be a reduction in costs relating to staff, materials and transport. The staff requirement to carry out this will be reduced by 2 FTE through vacancy management

**Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :**

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES/NO
---	--------

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES/NO
--	--------

<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES/NO
--	--------

**4. Assessment:**

<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES/NO
---	--------

<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES
---	-----

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening has been carried out for equality, rural and poverty impacts. Potential negative impacts have been identified in relation to:-

- Equalities – a reduced number of play areas will impact upon young people/ children, and potentially children with disabilities although this is not currently known.
- Rural Impacts - Potential greater impact in rural areas where there are not many/any alternatives; and
- Poverty – potential poverty impacts on families having to travel further to access free play opportunities, which will be reduced; reduced opportunities for development of social networks for families; potential barriers being created to social inclusion and integration.

Mitigation: It is only proposed to rationalise play areas where: sites are redundant, there is low play value, where further maintenance can no longer be justified in terms of cost, and / or there is adequate provision nearby.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Antisocial Behaviour</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Antisocial behaviour budget reductions</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.162m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>9.6</b>

Ref. CS2

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.162	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.162</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This budget covers the staff costs for 50% of the staff involved in preventing and responding to antisocial behaviour.

The total budget is £0.321m. Previously it was agreed that 50% of the costs would be met from HRA with £0.321m remaining in the General Fund. This was on the basis that a significant volume of work related to the management of council housing estates.

Staffing is as follows:-

Caithness - 2 Community Wardens + 1 Antisocial Behaviour Investigator covering the North  
 Inverness - 2 Community Wardens + 1 Antisocial Investigator covering the South  
 Lochaber - 2 Community Wardens  
 Ross and Cromarty - 2 Community Wardens

It is proposed that 100% of costs are now shifted to the HRA.

This means that we would retain all post holders, with no impact on jobs.

As the whole function would be funded from the HRA, Community Wardens and ASB Staff could only do work on behalf of the HRA.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

Both staff groups are currently able to contribute to wider joint enforcement activity - for example assisting with issue of fixed penalty notices in town centres.

This would mean staff would no longer be able to carry out non-HRA enforcement activities.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	No
--	----

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	No
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	No
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	Yes  NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.  There could be a negative impact in town centres if staff are no longer able to assist with joint enforcement / other community safety work.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Parking &amp; Car Parks</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Charging for Parking &amp; Services</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.680m income</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>17</b>

Ref. CS5

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	1.407	+ 1.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.407</b>	<b>+ 1.0</b>

Service Impact
No impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

#### 1. TARRIF REVIEW £1.010m

- Establish a minimum fee of £1 for 1<sup>st</sup> period of parking at all locations.
- Apply better delineation between Long Stay & Short Stay Parking.
- The proposed tariffs have been established within the context of the site locations and their primary use. This is to ensure that the tariff is compatible with traffic management requirements and also affordable and in perspective with the National rates.
- The tariffs proposed are still very competitive compared to both the private sector and other similar facilities provided in Highland and Nationally.
- Off Street Tariffs will adhere to the following model – Short stay sites will be £1 per hour with no all-day parking. Long stay sites will be max stay of 10 or 24 hours and will involve larger tariffs. Parking tariffs will be equitable across the authority with uplifts required in Fort William, Aviemore & Fort Augustus and some minor uplifts in Inverness. This will also involve removal of seasonal limits at some sites.
- Any additional Car Parks introduced will follow this model with a separate all day tariff for leisure/tourist related visitor car parks of £3 per day to match other providers. A separate higher tariff will apply to special vehicles such as coaches and heavy goods vehicles.

Table below shows a summary of tariff ranges per length of stay:

Off Street Parking Tariffs			
Length		Tariff Range (£)	
1st Period	Minimum Fee	1.00	
2hrs		1.00	2.00
3hrs		2.00	
4hrs		2.00	3.00
10 hr		3.00	4.00
24hr		5.00	7.00

#### 2. CAR PARK ROLLOUT £0.067m

- The rollout of charging at Council Car Parks which are currently free to use.
- Year one will involve 14 car parks - Broadford North & Village, Chanonry Point, Mallaig East Bay & Village, Nairn Library, Harbour, Cumming St, The Maggot, Ainess Station, Dingwall Southside, Ullapool Latheron, Kyle Village, Lairg Shin Falls
- There is a forecast of £210k turnover but £143k implementation costs must be deducted in year one.
- These sites will fall into two main categories, visitor/leisure related and urban/service related.
- These sites are spread across the authority. This would be the first of a 5 year program.
- All the selected sites are subject to more detailed review and consultation prior to implementation.

### 3. NEW SERVICES & UPLIFTS £0.370m

- Uplift of all Parking Permits Fees, on street and off street by 5%. Our current permits are relatively cheap in comparison to most local authorities, especially in city locations.
- Update Lochaber Permit charges to levels more reflective of costs to administer the scheme.
- Removal of free residents parking allowance in Lochaber.
- Introduce a range of new Permit Services
- Introduce a new range of Parking services – season tickets etc. (There is some delivery risk involved due to the nature of the new services being offered and the level of uptake that will actually occur.)
- Introduce new cost recovery charges for Parking Services.
- Introduce Pay & Display at Council Offices as per HQ Inverness Model

#### Table of Fees:

Inverness		Frequency	FEE 18/19
Resident's or visitor permits		annual	£58.00
Senior Citizens resident's permit		annual	£28.00
Lost or damaged permits		single fee	£28.00
Business and business visitor permits		annual	£185.00
Lost or damaged business parking permit		single fee	£92.00
Contract parking card - Rose St MSCP		monthly	£63.00
Permit Bay - Rose St MSCP		monthly	£98.00
<b>Lochaber</b>			
Resident's or visitor permits		annual	£40.00
Senior Citizens resident's permit		annual	£20.00
Lost or damaged permits		single fee	£20.00
Business and business visitor permits	NEW	annual	£100.00
Lost or damaged business parking permit	NEW	single fee	£50.00
Short Stay Parking card - Lochaber	Discounted parking		withdraw
Withdraw FREE parking permit - Lochaber	Free parking		withdraw
Contract Parking (Season ticket) - Lochaber (approx.. 80 No)		annual	£120.00
<b>New Services and Cost Recovery</b>			
Suspension of On Street P&D Parking Bay	£50 fixed administration charge applies	daily fee	£10.00
Suspension of other On Street bay	£50 fixed administration charge applies	daily fee	£5.00
Suspension of an Off Street Car Park (Non P&D) - Minimum	£50 fixed administration charge applies	daily fee	£5.00
Suspension of an Off Street Car Park (Pay & Display)	(Bay Rate X Charging day X Number of Bays X Occupancy) + Admin e.g. £1 x 10hours x 5 x 70% + £100 admin= £85	daily fee	calculated
Residents Visitor Parking Vouchers	Book of 20 x 3hr (200 estimate)		£20.00
Trades Permit (services)	Council wide (200 estimate)	annual	£200.00
Essential User Permit (medical, domiciliary care etc.)	Council wide (400 estimate)	annual	£50.00
Car Park Season Ticket (pre-paid parking Council-wide in designated car parks)	sold in 3-month units (1000 estimate)	single fee	£60.00

**Note: All figures include additional staff resource required to deliver the expanded services and new car park provision – 1 FTE budgeted at £0.040m circa HC07. This will add one member of staff to the existing technical team of 3.**

**Service Impact**

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This will have no impact on Service provision.

**Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :**

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b>  <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?  <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>NA</p>

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts have been carried out. The increase in charges may impact upon low income regular users of these facilities. However, comparisons of all sites Highland-wide with the National position have been considered to ensure that charging will be affordable and relative to its use for traffic management goals and impact on users. There may be some rural impact as a result of introduction of new charges in rural tourism locations but it is anticipated this impact will be limited.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS9</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Environmental Health</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Environmental Health Fees &amp; Charges by 10%</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.046m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.046	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.046	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Environmental Health Service charges for a number of services it provides, including Subject Access Fees, Animal Licence Fees, Fish Export Certificates, Private Water Supply Fees, Pest Control Fees and Analytical Fees. This proposal is to increase these fees by 10%, generating an additional £46,000 in income.

The Environmental Health service has conducted informal benchmarking with other local authorities on their fees and charges. The Council is currently in the second top quartile for these charges. These proposals would not change our position, although this will be dependent on the decisions made by other Councils during their budget setting process.

With regards to Fish Export Certificates, members should be aware that the increases introduced last year were contentious with our customers within the industry, with representations made to the Council via MPs, MSPs, Council Members and Trade organisations. Whilst the scale of the increase this year is not as high, we would anticipate similar representations this year. Environmental Health services provide service which is highly responsive to the needs of the Fish Export industry within the Highlands, and have been able to offer some flexibility. This will continue during FY 2018/19.

### Service Impact

There will be no aspect of the service that will stop or reduce. We do not anticipate any reduction in demand for the service.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES/NO

<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA <del>YES/NO/NA</del>
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b> The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Harbours and Ferries</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges - Ferry Dues 3.9% (RPI as at Sep 17)</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£2.160m income</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>17</b>

Ref. CS12

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.174	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.174</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This applies to Raasay, Sconser, UIG and the Small Isles.

There will be an uplift in dues at Uig as a result of the larger ferry to fund the additional maintenance requirements at the redeveloped port, this will have to be negotiated with Transport Scotland and will probably be effective towards the end of the FY 2018/19. A further increase is yet to be agreed to pay for the capital works.

For all routes the charges will be subject to RPI (3.9% as at Sep 2017).

From October 2017 there will be an increase in ferry dues at Uig to pay for the design of the capital work already agreed. This has been agreed at £167k per annum for 10 years as part of the Capital repayment over that period.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This is an annual uplift of charges and has no impact on service delivery.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, i.e. screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES  NA

<b>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</b>	
---	--

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening for equality, poverty and rural impacts has been carried out. This has highlighted that there are potential impacts on rural communities.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Harbours and Ferries</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges including - Pier/Harbour Dues, Hire of Plant and other sales material</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£2.160m income</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>17</b>

Ref. CS13

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.073	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.073</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This income target reflects an increase in fees for harbour services and berthing fees, hire of plant and miscellaneous sales, broken down as follows:

- £64k Piers & Harbour dues @ 3.9% inflation (RPI as at Sep 2017)
- £3k hire of plant income @ 10% uplift
- £6k other sales material @10% uplift

The majority of income is raised from the big fishing boats at Lochinver and KLB which pay dues at 2% of their landing value. Our income therefore will fluctuate according to the landing value.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This is an annual uplift of charges and has no impact on service delivery.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	Yes
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES
<p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA

### Summary of Community Impact:

Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. This has highlighted that the increase in fees could impact on the economy of fragile rural communities.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS15</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Transport and Logistics</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>New Charges - Establish a MOT test centre for Council Vehicles and Taxis.</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.034m income</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>7 in Lotland Street workshop</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.010	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.010</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The proposal is to provide an MOT facility in the Lotland Street depot, Inverness for cars and light vehicles. The proposal will require a capital investment before any inspections can be undertaken.

It is estimated that making changes to the layout of the site, purchasing and installing equipment, training staff and other miscellaneous costs will be in the region of £50k.

The cost of a standard MOT is £54.85. To generate £10k we would need to carry out circa 180 MOTs in the first year, average 4 per week over 50 weeks.

It is not planned at this time that the workshop will carry out any maintenance or servicing of private vehicles to enable them to pass the MOT.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

External work will not be carried out to the detriment of HC vehicle maintenance so careful planning and scheduling of MOTs will be required.

It is estimated that 3 mechanics would be asked to undertake training to become MOT testers. This will offer an opportunity to enrich their current role.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO

<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Street Lighting</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Communities to provide their own Christmas lights</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>

Ref. CS16

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.035	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.035</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<b>Service Impact</b>
No impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Service to stop installation (and removal) of Christmas lights with responsibility transferred to communities.

Current funding of Christmas lighting:

#### **Inverness**

Common Good - £65,000, Strothers Lane £2,500 (invoiced), Christmas Extravaganza £3,200 (invoiced). Under recovery of actual costs circa £10,000 in 2015/16; for 2016/17 this has been reduced. Increase payment from Common Good fund to cover actual costs.

#### **Street lighting revenue funded (free) Christmas lights – c£30k/year**

Landward Inverness (Beauly, Tomich, Cannich, Balnain, Drumnadrochit, Invermoriston, Fort Augustus, Gorthleck, Foyers, Dores, Tomatin, Ardersier, Croy and Balloch) - c£10k  
 Nairn (Auldearn and Cawdor) - £7.5k  
 Lochaber - c£9K  
 Portree - £2.5k

Christmas Lights – recharged:

Smithton & Culloden - £600  
 Thurso - £3,000  
 Ardgay - £150  
 Invergarry - £240  
 Inverlochy - £175  
 Inshes Park - £700  
 Woodside - £650

Report to be taken to EDI committee in summer 2018 to confirm Christmas Lighting policy that:

- a) communities become responsible for 100% of the funding of Christmas lighting.
- b) communities become responsible for arranging the installation of Christmas lighting (due to quantity of lights a transition period may be required in Inverness).  
 For Inverness a community group such as the BID would be required to take over and develop a local tendering process to provide local contractors to undertake the erection and removal of the chirms lighting such as that undertaken by the East Gate and other private areas.  
 Note – an alternative option is for service to continue to install on a full cost recovery basis (including overtime costs).
- c) Provision of Health & Safety guidance for community groups to install and remove Christmas lights.
- d) Revenue saving of £35,000.

**Service Impact***(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

Service will reduce overtime levels in November, December and January and be able to increase resources allocated to delivery of the LED power reduction programme.

There is no anticipated reduction in FTE's.

**Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) :**

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NO
---	----

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
--	----

<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
--	----

<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA

**Summary of Community Impact:**

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts. The communities affected though will be required to seek alternative resources to fund Christmas lighting in the future.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Public Conveniences</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Review of public conveniences and the Introduction of Charging for Highly Used Facilities</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.809m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>45</b>

Ref. CS17

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.301	21.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.301	21.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Significant impact on service</p>
---

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Whilst the impact of these proposals on the service has been identified as 'significant', we will aim to reduce the staffing impact through a greater focus on income maximisation and community asset transfer.

The Council operates 96 public conveniences and 28 comfort schemes across the Highlands. The operating budget for this service for Financial Year 2017/18 was £0.809m. However, a budget pressure of £0.463m has developed following the insourcing of the contract in July 2017, which has resulted in an operating budget for this year of £1.272m. The proposals contained within this template will reduce the budget pressure by £0.263m and deliver the savings proposed for Financial Year 2018/19.

This can be achieved through a combination of:

- Review of current provision, including some rationalisation of 29 existing facilities (appendix 1 - in consultation with Members at Ward Business Meetings) combined with the introduction of new working practices and operational structures within the Public Conveniences service - £0.338m.
- Introducing:
  - a charge of 50p per visit at 10 high use facilities, and
  - increasing charges at existing payable facilities to 50p - £0.336

Consideration had been given to introducing a charge of £1 to maximise potential income. However, there is evidence from other local authorities that introducing a charge at this level could decrease income by as much as 50%. The City of Westminster is the only other authority in the UK we are aware of that charges £1. We would therefore propose a charge of 50p across all of our facilities where a charge is made

- Reviewing the payment structure for premises operating the Highland Comfort Scheme, and reducing the highest level of payment from £500 per month to £300 per month - £0.030

These figures include the creation of a temporary (2 year) staff resource to enable the delivery changes described above in consultation with Elected Members and other stakeholders, deliver community asset transfer of facilities where appropriate, and establish new Highland Comfort Schemes where this has been identified as the most appropriate way of delivering the service – 1 FTE budgeted at circa HC06/07. This will flow from the proposed restructure of the whole PC operation.

A capital investment of £0.1m will also be required to install payment barriers at the 10 new facilities identified and in some existing facilities - this has been taken into account in these savings proposals

The Public Conveniences service was brought back in-house in July 2017. At this time, it was recognised that a restructuring of the operation was required to improve service provision and reduce costs. This was communicated to staff at the time of transfer through the TUPE measures letter issued to them. There has also been ongoing dialogue between Amenity Services, employees and the Trades Unions since July 2017 on our approach to service delivery and the changes required to the service.

## Service Impact

The proposals impact in two main ways:

1. Some rationalisation and reduction in staffing through the implementation of new working practices and staffing structures. It is acknowledged that a flexible approach to implementation will be required to reflect local circumstances.
2. The introduction of charging at an additional 10 sites as follows:
  - a. Dornoch Shore Road
  - b. Thurso Tanyard
  - c. Golspie
  - d. Dunvegan
  - e. Carrbridge
  - f. Ballachulish
  - g. Corran Ferry
  - h. Viewforth, Fort William
  - i. Glencoe
  - j. Drumnadrochit

These sites have been selected as the most appropriate for charging based on usage data collected during summer 2017, and include an allowance for reduction in usage following the introduction of charges

It is recognised that the Council's Public Conveniences make a significant contribution to making the Highlands an attractive destination for visitors, businesses and residents. Any adverse impacts of these proposals can be mitigated through, for example:

- sign posting alternative facilities,
- increasing the number of businesses participating in the Highland Comfort Scheme, and
- increasing the number of facilities operated by Community Groups

## Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES/NO
---	--------

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES/NO
--	--------

<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES/NO
--	--------

### 4. Assessment:

<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	YES/NO
---	--------

<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES
---	-----

### Summary of Community Impact:

A screening has been carried out for equalities, rural and poverty impacts followed by a full equalities impact assessment. Potential impacts identified are:

- Equality – the rationalisation of toilets are likely to have a disproportionate impact upon the elderly and disabled users,
- Rural Impacts – less well used facilities are more prevalent in rural areas and with fewer alternatives nearby,
- Poverty – the introduction of charges for some facilities will have a potential negative impact on users although the proposed locations for charging are more likely to impact upon tourism in rural areas.

Some mitigation has been identified through:

- sign posting alternative facilities,
- increasing the number of businesses participating in the Highland Comfort Scheme, and
- increasing the number of facilities operated by Community Groups

## Appendix 1 – Public Conveniences Proposals for Change

District	Facility	Comments	Labour Savings	Rates/ Electric/ Water Est Av Savings	Total Savings
Sutherland	Achmelvich*	No disabled facility, demountable construction, deteriorating condition. Hostel & Campsite highland comfort possibilities. Either close or transfer to campsite/organise Comfort Scheme.	£6165.39	£1201.26	£7,366.65
Sutherland	Kinlochbervie	Serves harbour and fishing community, consider asset transfer to harbour or possible closure.	£5980.94	£2402.52	£8,383.46
Sutherland	Kylesku	Adjacent hotel could be used for full time/seasonal Highland Comfort. Possible closure	£4490.20	£2402.52	£6,892.72
Sutherland	Lairg	Consider transfer of operation to community centre as HCS	£6286.28	£2402.52	£8,688.80
Sutherland	Rhiconnich	Kinlochbervie is close by. Hotel is adjacent for Highland Comfort during summer period. Rhiconnich Hotel	£6286.28	£2402.52	£8,688.80
Sutherland	Scourie	Possible HCS on route of NC500. Hotel, anchorage, village hall	£6286.28	£2402.52	£8,688.80
Sutherland	Smoo*	Durness close by, close or community run if wanted. Possible HCS with youth hostel.	£5077.38	£1201.26	£6,278.6
Sutherland	Talmine*	Possible option for HCS at Melness community centre	£6286.28	£1201.26	£7,487.54
Sutherland	Tarbet*	Possible option for HCS e.g. the storehouse restaurant. Mobile cleaning	£3384.92	£1201.26	£4,586.18
Caithness	Thurso Harbour*	Tanyard on same street, unnecessary for two in such close proximity	£5077.38	£1201.26	£6,278.64
Caithness	Wick Camps*	Building quality is deteriorating, Whitechapel is close by.	£5077.38	£1201.26	£6,278.64
Caithness	Halkirk*	Possible Comfort Scheme, e.g. Hotel. Summer only	£6769.84	£1201.26	£7,971.10
Caithness	Keiss	Change to 24 hr opening - summer only - mobile cleaning	£6769.84	£1201.26	£7,971.10
Caithness	Lybster*	Possible Comfort Scheme in community centre - mobile cleaning	£8462.30	£1201.26	£9,663.56
Sutherland	Helmsdale	In urgent need of refurbishment if required to be open. Consider summer opening only and option for comfort scheme with timespan in summer - mobile cleaning	£9429.42	£2402.52	£11,831.94
Mid & West Ross	Kinlochewe*	Adjacent hotel for HCS (Kinlochewe hotel) - possible closure and HCS	£6769.84	£1201.26	£7,971.10
Mid & West Ross	Kessock A9 North	Being reviewed as part of development proposals being considered by the Commercial Board.	£15,715.70	£2402.52	£18,118.22

District	Facility	Comments	Labour Savings	Rates/ Electric/ Water Est Av Savings	Total Savings
East Ross	Portmahomack	Possible summer opening only	p	£2402.52	£11,831.94
Mid & West Ross	Dingwall Ormidale	Tesco (open until midnight) nearby as are Town Centre cafés. Possible re-rate for winter period. Consider HCS e.g. British Legion, Town Hall etc.	£12,572.56	£2402.52	£14,975.08
Mid & West Ross	Avoch*	Building in poor condition, little option to change opening times. Preferred alternative is HCS, e.g. station hotel.	£5077.38	£1201.26	£6,278.64
Mid & West Ross	Fortrose Station Rd*	Consider closure, redirect to Rosemarkie PC. Consider HCS at community hall or Black Isle leisure centre. Otherwise leave open 24 hrs.	£3384.92	£1201.26	£4,586.18
Mid & West Ross	Rosemarkie	Community company café on site. Comfort Scheme would support this facility. Possible closure and replaced with HCS.	£9429.42	£2402.52	£11,831.94
Skye & Lochalsh	Elgol*	Building will need refurbishment. Adjacent to community hall consider HCS or transfer building.	£3384.92	£1201.26	£4,586.18
Inverness	Inverness Mealmarket	Consider alternatives through shops and hotels or closure	£56,576.52	£2402.52	£58,979.04
Inverness	Castle Wynd*	Seek to progress as part of Castle redevelopment	£5077.38	£1201.26	£6,278.64
Nairn	Nairn Harbour Street	Consider alternatives through shops and hotels or closure	£10,471.15	£2402.52	£12,873.67
Nairn	Nairn West Beach	Possible summer opening only.	£10,471.15	£2402.52	£12,873.67
Badenoch & Strathspey	Grantown, Burnfield	The building is in a bad state and requires full refurbishment including replacing all external drains.	£15,716	£2402.52	£18,119
Lochaber	Ft William Station Brae	Within walking distance of Viewforth facility and adjacent several cafés. Possible summer opening.	£11,674.52	£2402.52	£14,077.04

(\* designates seasonal site (summer only) currently not operational)

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS18</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Refuse Collection</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges within Waste Services - Commercial refuse collection and 3rd party trade waste 3%. Domestic bulky uplifts and wheelie bin sales 10%. Garden waste (brown bins) £5 increase</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£3.95m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.233	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.233	0.0

<b>Service Impact</b>
Moderate impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Waste services charge for a wide range of services including collection of garden waste, collection of waste from commercial customers and collection of domestic bulky items. The commercial waste collection service, in particular, operates in a highly competitive environment

The introduction of a £30 charge for the collection of garden waste (brown bins) has been successful, and we believe that the increase in the charge by £5 will not reduce uptake.

Similarly, increases in charges for the collection of commercial waste will have a moderate effect on our customer base and we believe that the income target set will be achievable

### Service Impact

There are no proposals to reduce or stop any of these services

Increases waste collection charges as follows:

1. Domestic bulky uplifts - 10%;
2. Wheeled bin sales – 10%;
3. Garden Waste Collection - £5 per permit;
4. Commercial collection – 3% on collection element;
5. 3<sup>rd</sup> party customer supplement – 3%. It is proposed to introduce a threshold above which this supplement would not apply. This threshold would be £100,000 total annual value of 3<sup>rd</sup> party contract. This will be based on the value of contracts on 1<sup>st</sup> April each year; and
6. Commercial customer contract change administration fee – 3%. However, this will not apply to customers already paying the 3<sup>rd</sup> party customer supplement. Details of changes to which the admin fee would apply are provided in Appendix 1.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

**1. Equality:** Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age , disability , sex , disability , gender identity , religion or belief , pregnancy or maternity , marriage or civil partnership )?

YES/NO

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES/NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES/NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES/NO  YES/NO/NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  Screening for equalities, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. There are potential negative impacts on the elderly and those with disabilities who may be unable to dispose of refuse themselves but are unable to pay for the service.  There are also potential poverty impacts on low income households, due to the impact on household resources (income, benefits, outgoings), and therefore the ability to access a service.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS19</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Refuse Collection</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Introduction of Waste Collection Charges to Previously Exempt Premises</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.025	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.025	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Over 120 halls across Highland have a free waste and recycling collection service.</p> <p>It is proposed to introduce a charge for waste collection from community managed or owned facilities such as village halls. Approximately 120 such facilities currently receive a free waste collection service from the Council. Their waste is classified as household waste, for which a charge can be made.</p> <p>In recognition of the role that these facilities play within the communities that they serve, it is proposed to offer a household waste collection service free of charge, i.e. one residual 240 litre bin and one blue 240 litre recycling bin, collected alternate weekly. Any additional capacity will be charged at the household rate under the existing Commercial Collection scheme.</p> <p>We have identified that £25,000 in additional income can be generated by this proposal.</p>
---

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>There will no aspects of the service that will stop or be reduced.</p>
--

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES/NO

<b>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</b>	YES
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out. No equality or rural impacts have been identified but a potential impact highlighted in relation to ability to pay for some existing clients. To mitigate this impact, a household waste collection will be offered to these premises for free – one residual and one recycling bin alternate weekly.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS20</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Refuse Collection</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Improved Controls for Waste that is Classified as Commercial/Industrial that we currently receive at our Household Waste Recycling Centres</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.006	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.006	0.0

<b>Service Impact</b>
Moderate impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Council currently receives commercial/industrial waste at our household waste recycling centres. Controls are in place to deter the misuse of the facilities at our recycling centres, previously agreed at the Community Services Committee. These proposals will complement these controls by preventing householders disposing of this material at our HWRCs. Similar systems are in use in other local authorities, and waste services would adopt best practice from these Councils

It is also proposed that implementation is deferred until October 2018 to allow sufficient time to develop these new systems

### Service Impact

No aspects of the service will stop or reduce

However, there is potential for fly tipping to increase as householders will be incurring additional costs and be subject to increased scrutiny if using the Council's HWRCs. It is proposed that implementation would be phased, with priority given to busier HWRCs in, for example, Inverness, Dingwall and Fort William. This may lead to increased usage in other sites which may have insufficient capacity. Finally, some of the waste currently disposed of at HWRCs may be disposed of via household waste collections, which could lead to increased collection and disposal costs

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	YES/NO
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES/NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES/NO

<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES/ <del>NO</del> YES/ <del>NO</del> /NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b> The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Refuse Collection</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Waste Collection Service Changes</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£2.330m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>252</b>

Ref. CS22

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.090	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.090</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

A priority recommendation of the Review of Waste carried out as part of the Council Redesign conducted during 2016/17 was to procure route optimisation software to improve the efficiency of the waste and recycling collection operation.

The Waste Services currently operates a fleet of 74 refuse collection vehicles across the Highlands, operating from 15 operational depots. The routes that these vehicles follow have been developed using a combination of historical information and local knowledge, and recent work conducted on reviewing these routes has identified that there are a number of issues such as:

- imbalance of workloads; and
- routes being too big to finish in normal working hours

Waste services are in the process of procuring route optimisation software that will address these issues and deliver a more cost effective service across the Highlands. This will lead to reduced transport costs and reduce the reliance on overtime to deliver collection services.

In order to fully optimise our collection routes, it will be necessary to change collection days for householders in some areas. This work has yet to be carried out, and full engagement with Elected Members, householders and businesses will be carried out prior to the introduction of any changes.

### Service Impact

No aspects of the service will reduce or stop. However, there may be changes to collection days for some householders to allow us to fully realise the benefits of the proposed changes. Full engagement with Elected Members, householders and businesses will be carried out prior to the introduction of any changes.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

**1. Equality:** Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age , disability , sex , disability , gender identity , religion or belief , pregnancy or maternity , marriage or civil partnership )?

YES/NO

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	YES/NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	YES/NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES/NO  YES/NO/NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS23</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Waste Awareness</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduction in Awareness and Education Budget for Waste Services</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.075m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.040	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.040	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Waste Services currently has a budget of £75k to deliver publicity and marketing for all of the services that it delivers. This includes household waste and recycling collections, commercial waste collections, operation of Household Waste Recycling Centres and the new garden waste collection service.

This proposal is to reduce the available budget by £40k. This will reduce the resources available to publicise and market our services, carry out engagement relating to service changes, or deliver campaigns addressed at improving recycling and waste minimisation. Greater use of ICT will help mitigate this

### Service Impact

Aspects of the service that will need to reduce or stop will include:

- publicising and marketing our services such as commercial waste collection and the new garden waste collection service;
- carry out engagement relating to service changes; and
- deliver campaigns addressed at improving recycling and waste minimisation

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES/NO
<p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES/NO/NA

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts carried out. No community impact identified. However, proposal may impact on the ability to change behaviours when seeking change going forward, especially relevant to recycling

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Service-Wide</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Other Fees/Charges - as listed</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>

CS25
------

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.145	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.145	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Road Condition Consents - an inflationary increase of 3.9% has been reflected in the saving  
Income from the sale of textiles under recycling (10% increase).  
External third party works, pest control, and recharges for some vehicles (10% increase).  
Minibus hire (15% increase) to realise additional £1k  
Water Cooler Sanitisation - 10% increase to realise additional £4k  
Burials and Cremations - inflationary increase of 3.9%

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

This is largely an annual uplift of charges and has no impact on service delivery.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, i.e. screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	YES
<p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES

### Summary of Community Impact:

Screening for equality, rural and poverty impacts has been undertaken. The minibus hire relates to the small fleet of 16 seat minibuses on lease to transport pupils from home to school. During down time these vehicles are hired out to HC affiliated groups and local schools. Current cost 80p per mile. Proposal is to increase this to 92p per mile

which may impact on some local community groups.

For burials and cremations, poverty Impacts have been identified, as fee increases may disproportionately affect low income families. Grants are available to some families on low income to mitigate the costs of funerals. Vulnerable groups that could be affected by these proposals include the unemployed and low income households

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Supporting People</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce Tenancy Support Services for Homelessness</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.600m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>

Ref. CS29

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.057	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Housing support services in relation to homelessness are procured through a framework agreement with a range of independent sector providers. Support is provided to help people acquire the skills to sustain a tenancy of their own. Support starts for people in temporary accommodation and is carried through to the initial period in a secure tenancy. Often support will be provided to people in their own tenancies where they are not managing and are at risk of eviction / loss of accommodation.

Housing Support Services are costed on an hourly rate charged by providers. The hourly rate is around £17.50.

The service was retendered in late 2016, with the new framework implemented from 1 April 2017.

Retendering resulted in some cost savings – as some of the tendered rates were reduced.

The outcome of the tendering exercise was a cost saving of £53k for the same overall number of hours of support.

This cost saving was not applied in 2017/18 – i.e. we were able to fund extra housing support hours for the same budget given the reduction in hourly rate.

To achieve a saving of £57k would require a reduction in 63 hours per week of housing support services to homeless people.

The service is due to be retendered during 2018.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

Housing Support Services are costed on an hourly rate charged by providers. The average hourly rate around £17.50 per hour.

To achieve a saving of £57k would require a reduction in 63 hours per week of housing support services to homeless people.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

**1. Equality:** Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age , disability , sex , disability , gender identity , religion or belief , pregnancy or maternity , marriage or civil partnership )?

Yes

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	No
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	Yes
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	YES  YES
<b>Summary of Community Impact</b>  Screening for equalities, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out followed by a full equalities impact assessment. The full assessment identified that impact is minimal and the reduction achieved through the retendering process. This will result in less than a 0.5% reduction in number of hours per week of support provided.  Mitigation is more effective management of the service to ensure that support is now targeted at clients who need this support the most with clients who need other agency support signposted to most appropriate service.  There is a positive impact in rural areas as a result of the retendering process, with a service now in place in rural communities which previously didn't exist.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS30</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Waste Disposal</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Waste Tipping Fees, Cardboard recycling and Scrap Metal - 10% increase in gate fee</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.120m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>n/a</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.012	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.012	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>The Council operates 2 landfill sites, at Seater in Caithness and Grainish at Aviemore. We currently charge 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to dispose of their waste at these sites, and this proposal is to increase the current gate fee by 10%.</p>
--

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No aspects of the service will stop or be reduced.</p>
--

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	YES/NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, i.e . screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  YES/NO/NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>CS31</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Travel Desk</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Travel and Subsistence Savings</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.556m across all Services</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.060	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.060	0.0

<b>Service Impact</b>
No impact on service

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The Travel Desk books transport (cars and public transport) and accommodation for Members and staff across the Council.

The booking request form for accommodation asks the traveller to list their 2 preferred choices of accommodation. These are generally not the cheapest available in the location. A saving of £60,000 has been identified if this option is removed and the traveller is instead asked to provide the post code of where they are going. This will enable the travel desk to search for the best value accommodation within that area.

### Service Impact

*(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)*

There is no impact on services being delivered.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NO
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	NA
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>	
The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Community Services</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Flood Alleviation</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce Flood Alleviation Budget</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.057m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>

Ref. CS32

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.027	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.027</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

Remove £27k from the Flood Alleviation Budget. The necessary maintenance and improvement works are identified through watercourse inspections. Balance of £30k to be retained to support maintenance of flood schemes.

### Service Impact

There will be little budget left for Flood Alleviation Works (the budget was reduced by £100,000 in 17/18). Works identified through watercourse inspections will require to be funded through Area Roads budgets, or if significant, through the capital programme. The budget is also used to fund minor coastal protection works for which there is no dedicated budget provision. There will therefore be less funding available for other roads maintenance functions to accommodate coastal protection works or works required through watercourse inspections.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	YES
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	YES  YES

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Screening for equalities, rural and poverty impacts has been carried out, with potential rural impacts identified.

Properties within flood risk areas will be at increased risk of flooding.

Minor maintenance/cleaning of watercourses could be funded through the Area Roads Budgets. Other more involved repairs or major clean-ups will require funding from capital or other funding sources.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>DI1</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Service Wide</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Efficiencies</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>N/A</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.068	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.068	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

<b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b>	
Reduction in economic projects and initiatives	50k
Business Team efficiencies	18k

<p><b>Service Impact</b> (include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</p> <p>The above proposal is a combination of efficiencies and reduction in economic projects and initiatives. In recent years the economic initiatives budget has been flexible and used to support a range of discretionary one off spends – from tourism initiatives, economic projects, training and in transition arrangements to mitigate employability budget reductions. There is no recurring commitment on the funding and therefore no direct service impact however it will reduce the flexibility of the service to respond and support economic projects.</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	NA
<p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts. The impact, as outlined above, is the reduced flexibility to support economic initiatives and projects.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		<b>Ref.</b>	<b>DI3</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Flood Risk Assessment</b>			
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce revenue budget for flood risk management</b>			
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.164m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>3</b>	

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.140	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.140	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The original budget for Flood Risk Management was established in 2011 at £264k following an allocation from Scottish Government. This was reduced in 2017 to £164k/ annum.

The proposed D&I4 revenue reduction would result in a reduction of £140k, leaving an annual budget of £24k. **This residual amount would be augmented by the Flood Risk Management Plan budget line in the proposed capital programme under Flood Protection.**

### Service Impact

If implemented, the budgets would be sufficient to deliver the current level of services the Flood Team provide. The functions include:-

- Specialist flood risk and drainage advice on planning applications.
- Post flood investigations and general advice to the public on flood risk.
- Watercourse assessments and routine maintenance.
- Severe weather pre-inspections of high risk culverts/screens.
- Awareness raising activities (developing community resilience).
- Updating and participating in the production of a local Flood Risk Management Strategy and Plan with SEPA.

The associated flooding budget lines in the proposed capital programme deliver proposed flood alleviation schemes, supported by government and studies and strategies to develop further flood mitigation measures for future grant funding bids as Government funding cycles emerge.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO

<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>NA</p>
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>Local Authorities are considered to be 'Responsible Authorities' under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 and have statutory duties and responsibilities to manage flood risk. The Flood Risk Management Team provides both statutory and non-statutory services which meet the needs of the most vulnerable communities, many of which will never see capital solutions to their problems. The impacts of climate change are expected to significantly increase the risk of flooding across Scotland, with a significant impact on the economy and communities.</p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Building Standards</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£0.145m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Ref. DI5

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.015	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.015	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges - Development &amp; Infrastructure - Planning Fees Advertising 10%</p>
--

<p><b>Service Impact</b> <i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i></p>
--

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Property - Estates</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges - Rents</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£2.484m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>5</b>

Ref. DI6

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.075	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.075</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<b>Service Impact</b>
No impact on service

<b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b>
Uplift Current Fees & Charges - Rents 2%

<b>Service Impact</b>
<i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i>
No impact – rents are renegotiated on a 5 year cycle on individual leaseholders based on comparable rents elsewhere and it is considered that the proposed increase is deliverable

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NO
<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b>	
<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	NA
<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>	
The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>DI8</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Property Asset Management</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Reduce Council Property Assets</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£2.484m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>All Staff</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.150	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.150</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This saving proposal will require the Council to further review the occupation of all operational assets (both leased and owned) including offices, schools and HLH premises to establish where effective rationalisation can be deployed to allow us to reduce the number of operational buildings that we occupy whilst providing services to Highland wide communities.

Council Services will be required to give up property space and consider different ways of working to assist in this saving being realised.

It is essential that we get the support of Council Directors and Services when investigating the current use of space and commitment to support the drive to reduce the space we currently occupy.

### Service Impact

Council Services will be required to relocate to alternative available facilities as well as freeing up under-utilised accommodation to support the rationalisation of property space.

Opportunities will be identified in regards to mobile and flexible working and this will be encouraged to improve the efficiency of how Council services will in future be delivered.

A community approach to the future use of school premises will be encouraged to allow more services to be delivered where practicable from local school facilities.

The continued rationalisation of property assets also provides the opportunity to share premises with external partners such as the NHSH, DWP and Police.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

**1. Equality:** Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age , disability , sex , disability , gender identity , religion or belief , pregnancy or maternity , marriage or civil partnership )?

NO

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA  NA
<b>Summary of Community Impact:</b>  Where we can deliver services from local hub type facilities along with external partners then this will be a positive outcome for local communities as more services will in future be delivered from one facility.  This has recently been achieved via the Department for Work and Pensions leasing office space in our new Wick and Fort William Offices. The sharing of facilities has been seen as an extremely positive outcome by the people that use these local services.  The process of rationalisation of premises will take into account access issues, ensuring premises are accessible for all staff and members of the public where appropriate.  The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	D & I		<b>Ref.</b>	DI9
<b>Budget Heading</b>	Service Wide			
<b>Savings Name</b>	Uplift Current Fees & Charges			
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>		

Financial Year	Savings £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.003	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.003	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Uplift Current Fees &amp; Charges – P &amp; BW Fee Income - Photocopy sales 10%</p>
---

<p><b>Service Impact</b> (include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce) n/a</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>			<b>Ref.</b>	<b>DI11</b>
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Energy &amp; Sustainability</b>				
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Increase in Renewable Heat Incentive Income</b>				
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£1.281m income</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>0</b>		

Financial Year	Income £m	Staff Impact FTE
2018/19	0.400	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.400</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>No impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Income Proposal

The recent installation of additional Biomass Boilers to our Public buildings will allow us to apply to OFGEM to receive additional RHI income for each new boiler we have installed.

We have also engaged a new Biomass Maintenance contractor and their improved performance compared to the previous contractor has allowed us to optimise our existing Biomass boilers to ensure that the maximum amount of RHI income continues to be achieved.

### Service Impact

The new Biomass boilers have reduced our dependency on oil fired boilers, are sustaining local employment via the Biomass Service contractor and are helping to reduce the Councils carbon footprint. Overall the installation of Biomass boilers within the Councils property portfolio is having a positive environmental impact on our built estate.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p><b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p><b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA  NA

**Summary of Community Impact:**

The installation of Biomass boilers is having a positive impact on our communities via reducing our carbon footprint and supporting employment in the Highlands.

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Service Wide</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Vacancy Management</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>		<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Ref. DI12

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.338	3.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.338</b>	<b>3.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Moderate impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

3 Vacant Posts 50k, 29k & £49k (Property Surveyor, Road Safety post and Employability & Recruitment Adviser)  
Vacancy Management 210k

### Service Impact

There may be delays in response times to queries from the general public and other services and sales targets will be more challenging but it is considered that the loss of the Property Surveyor post can be covered by redistribution of workloads. The latter also applies to the Road Safety and employability posts. A review of further vacant posts is also underway.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p>	NA
<p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA

### Summary of Community Impact:

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Building Standards</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Planning and building standards - fee income</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£4.674m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	

Ref. DI13

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.150	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	0.150	0.0

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

<p><b>Detailed Description of Savings Proposal</b></p> <p>Increase Planning and Building Standards fee income</p>
---

<p><b>Service Impact</b> <i>(include aspects of the service which will stop or reduce)</i></p> <p>Reduced investment in service</p>
---

<b>Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :</b>	
<p><b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, sex <input type="checkbox"/>, disability <input type="checkbox"/>, gender identity <input type="checkbox"/>, religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/>, pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/>, marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/>)?</p>	NO
<p><b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?</p>	NO
<p><b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?</p>	NO
<p><b>4. Assessment:</b></p> <p>a) Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?</p> <p>b) Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?</p>	NA NA
<p><b>Summary of Community Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.</p>	

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>D &amp; I</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Property</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Redesign of Property Services (Efficiencies)</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£4.440m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>143</b>

Ref. DI14

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	0.192	0.0
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.192</b>	<b>0.0</b>

<p><b>Service Impact</b></p> <p>Slight impact on service</p>
--

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

This proposal consists of a reduction in the revenue asbestos management budget by £42k as well as targeting Service efficiencies (£150k) that will be delivered by bringing external property related engineering service contracts in-house thus reducing the reliance on external contractors.

### Service Impact

There will be a positive impact on our Service as we will increase the capability and capacity of the new Facilities Management Team to carry out engineering inspection work that is currently being carried out by external contractors.

### Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications) :

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , disability <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NO
---	----

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NO
--	----

<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NO
--	----

#### 4. Assessment:

<b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available?	NA
---	----

<b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA
---	----

### Summary of Community Impact:

The Community Impact will be positive as we would look to increase our local Facilities Management capability, and support local employment delivering service inspection contracts via locally employed staff.

The proposal has no direct equality, rural or poverty impacts.

## Budget Template

<b>Service</b>	<b>Council-wide</b>		
<b>Budget Heading</b>	<b>Redesign</b>		
<b>Savings Name</b>	<b>Redesign</b>		
<b>Current Budget (£m)</b>	<b>£567.7m</b>	<b>Current Staffing (FTE)</b>	<b>8,000</b>

Ref. Redesign

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Savings £m</b>	<b>Staff Impact FTE</b>
2018/19	2.250	TBC
2019/20		
2020/21		
2021/22		
2022/23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.250</b>	<b>TBC</b>

### Service Impact

Service and staff impacts will vary depending on each redesign review. This will be considered by the Redesign Board when it makes its recommendations.

### Detailed Description of Savings Proposal

The proposal is to find savings from a range of redesign reviews, redesigning both services and processes. The savings will be in the form of:

- reducing expenditure,
- increasing income and
- preventing future budget pressures.

Review activity will draw on various methods e.g. peer reviews and Lean reviews.

Service reviews in the current programme are: music tuition (removes future budget pressure); commissioned services for children; grey fleet; car parking; procured legal services; and building trades services. Further service reviews need to be identified.

Savings from reviews concluded in 2017 can also be captured from 2018/19 as some of those required business case development or needed more time or other support to enable the change agreed to be implemented. They were for: waste services; children's services; administration in schools; additional support needs (ASN) in schools; street cleaning; street lighting; and public transport.

The Redesign board has also offered challenge and a steer on reviews initiated within services, namely on harbours, fleet maintenance and school lets.

In addition at least 20 Lean reviews are expected by end 2018/19.

Redesign reviews are overseen by the Redesign Board. The Board makes its recommendations to Council (or sometimes to the appropriate strategic committee). With a budget savings target set for redesign, once review recommendations are agreed through the Council's governance, savings will be removed from service budgets, adjusted for implementation timescales where necessary.

### Service Impact

The experience of Lean reviews carried out to date shows that service impacts are positive. They improve processes for people using Council services, people working in Council services and have enabled either budget reductions to be made (by deleting vacant posts) or are enabling ways of making sure that our billing is improved so that all income due is paid timeously. Some improve the service and process within current resources, so improve efficiency and productivity but have not released a saving.

Peer reviews challenge whether we have the right service delivery model in place and whether another arrangement would be better and more affordable. They follow methods of enquiry and engagement but each review will have its own conclusions.

Where significant change is recommended to the current service delivery model, business cases may need to be developed or additional capacity may be needed in the service to support the change. Sometimes this will require additional resource, and sometimes sourced externally. For some reviews this can mean the changes required cannot be made immediately so savings can be delayed.

**Community Impacts (Equality, Rural and Poverty implications ) : Impact assessments are carried out for each peer review and reported to the Redesign Board.**

<b>1. Equality:</b> Will the change have a negative impact on people (customers or staff) with protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010 (age <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , disability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , sex <input type="checkbox"/> , gender identity <input type="checkbox"/> , religion or belief <input type="checkbox"/> , pregnancy or maternity <input type="checkbox"/> , marriage or civil partnership <input type="checkbox"/> )?	NA
---	----

<b>2. Rural:</b> Could the change have a greater negative impact on people or services in rural areas?	NA
--	----

<b>3. Poverty:</b> Could the change have a negative impact on individuals, groups or vulnerable communities who are affected by (or at risk from) poverty?	NA
--	----

<b>4. Assessment:</b> <b>a)</b> Has evidence and assessment of Community Impact been recorded, ie screening and/or full assessment carried out and available? <b>b)</b> Is mitigating action identified in the case of negative impact?	NA
---	----

**Summary of Community Impact:**

Review teams are aware of the need to assess community impact of their proposals and are advised where they can get support to do this in-house (policy team).